

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Connect America Fund	)	WC Docket No. 10-90
	)	
Universal Service Reform -- Mobility Fund	)	WT Docket No. 10-208
	)	

To: The Commission

**REPLY COMMENTS OF ATN INTERNATIONAL AND  
BUFFALO-LAKE ERIE WIRELESS SYSTEMS LLC DBA  
BLUE WIRELESS**

Douglas J. Minster  
Vice President, Government and Regulatory Affairs  
**ATN International, Inc.**  
500 Cummings Center, Suite 2450  
Beverly, MA 01915  
(978) 619-1303  
May 11, 2017

Brian Gelfand  
President  
**Buffalo-Lake Erie Wireless Systems Co., L.L.C.**  
**d/b/a Blue Wireless**  
4915 Auburn Avenue , Suite 200  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(716) 631-2011

L Charles Keller  
**Wilkinson Barker Knauer LLP**  
1800 M Street, NW, Suite 800-North  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 383-3414  
*Counsel to ATN International, Inc. and  
Buffalo-Lake Erie Wireless Systems Co., LLC  
dba Blue Wireless*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction and Summary .....	1
II. Option B Best Advances the Commission’s Goals.....	3
III. Option A Has Positive Elements, But Could Delay the Transition to MF-II .....	7
IV. The New Data Collection in Option C Would Undermine the Commission’s Goals .....	8
A. A New Data Collection Could Significantly Delay Implementation of MF-II .....	8
B. The Option C Data Collection May Undermine the Goal of Expanding Mobile Coverage to Unserved Areas .....	11
C. The Option C Data Collection May Not Result in More Accurate Coverage Data or Fewer Challenges .....	13
V. Conclusion .....	14

Before the  
**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION**  
Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Connect America Fund	)	WC Docket No. 10-90
	)	
Universal Service Reform -- Mobility Fund	)	WT Docket No. 10-208
	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS OF ATN INTERNATIONAL AND  
BUFFALO-LAKE ERIE WIRELESS SYSTEMS LLC DBA  
BLUE WIRELESS**

ATN International, Inc., (“ATN”) on behalf of itself and its subsidiaries Choice Communications, LLC, NTUA Wireless, LLC, and Commnet Wireless, LLC (“ATN”) and Buffalo-Lake Erie Wireless Systems, LLC dba Blue Wireless (“Blue Wireless”) reply to the comments submitted in response to the further notice of proposed rulemaking attached to the *Mobility Fund Phase II Order*.<sup>1</sup>

**I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY**

As discussed in more detail below, the initial comments do not undermine ATN’s and Blue Wireless’s support for the Updated Joint Proposal, described in the Further Notice as “Option B,” as the best way to achieve the Commission’s goals for the Mobility Fund Phase II

---

<sup>1</sup> *Connect America Fund; Universal Service Reform – Mobility Fund*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 32 FCC Rcd 2152 (2017) (“Order” or “Further Notice” as appropriate). *See also Connect America Fund; Universal Service Reform – Mobility Fund*, Order, DA 17-347 (WTB rel. Apr. 11, 2017) (extending comment and reply deadlines).

(“MF-II”) challenge process to bring the benefits of mobile broadband to rural Americans that currently live on the wrong side of the digital divide.<sup>2</sup>

Option A also has merit in that it would make it easier for challengers to propose corrections to the Form 477 coverage data,<sup>3</sup> although the potential for more challenges could slow the transition to MF-II.

The detailed new proposal in CTIA’s comments (“Option C”) includes some promising refinements to the challenge process,<sup>4</sup> but an expansive new data collection specific to this purpose risks delaying the transition to MF-II support. As proposed, the new data collection also could significantly expand the list of areas eligible for MF-II support to include areas already served, undermining the purpose of MF-II to expand LTE coverage to areas that currently lack it. The new data collection also could lead to gaming of the data.

In order to facilitate a rapid transition to MF-II support, the Commission should codify and conduct the challenge process as quickly as possible, with the January 31, 2018 date in the Order as an outer bound for completion of the challenge process.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Further Notice, 32 FCC Rcd at 2238-39 ¶¶ 241-46, *citing* Letter from ATN, AT&T, and Blue Wireless to Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, WT Docket Nos 10-208, WC Docket No. 10-90 (filed Feb. 9, 2017) (“Option B”).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 2236-38 ¶¶ 232-40.

<sup>4</sup> Comments and Petition for Reconsideration of CTIA, WC Docket No. 10-90 and WT Docket No. 10-208 (filed Apr. 26, 2017) (“Option C” or “CTIA comments,” as appropriate).

<sup>5</sup> Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2154 ¶ 3 (“We expect to ... conclude the challenge process by January 31, 2018 [and] ... commence the auction shortly thereafter.”). ATN has explained that the challenge process should be completed in 2017 and the auction conducted in late 2017 or early 2018. Letter from Wade McGill, Vice President, ATN, to Marlene H. Dortch, FCC, WT Docket No. 10-208, at 4 (filed Nov. 9, 2016) (“ATN Nov. 9 Ex Parte”)

## II. OPTION B BEST ADVANCES THE COMMISSION’S GOALS

As ATN and Blue Wireless noted in their initial comments, the Order sets out a thorough and appropriate set of criteria for a challenge process: Accurately identifying areas that lack unsubsidized 4G LTE service; efficiently resolving disputes about eligible areas to transition support quickly to MF-II; appropriately managing tradeoffs among burdens, timeliness, and accuracy; avoiding excessive burdens on small providers; and building upon Form 477 data, the best coverage data source currently available.<sup>6</sup> ATN and Blue Wireless continue to believe that Option B best achieves these goals.

Option B leverages the existing Form 477 data without imposing any new data collection burdens on carriers. Some parties note that the Form 477 data are not perfect,<sup>7</sup> but they are – as the Commission has noted – the best data available.<sup>8</sup> CTIA contends that relying on Form 477 data “will result in an unnecessarily high number of challenges that will impose significant burdens on providers and Commission staff.”<sup>9</sup> It is difficult to imagine, however, that the volume of challenges could surpass the burdens on carriers and Commission staff of agreeing upon and implementing an entirely new data collection.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, the rigorous standard for data that challengers must assemble under Option B will be an effective deterrent to excessive or frivolous challenges. It also is important to bear in mind that Form 477 filers are not obligated to

---

<sup>6</sup> ATN/Blue Wireless comments at 2, citing Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2235-36 ¶¶ 226-31. Unless otherwise noted, references in this reply to parties’ “comments” refer to initial comments in this proceeding filed on or about April 26, 2017.

<sup>7</sup> See, e.g., CTIA comments at 6-8.

<sup>8</sup> Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2236 ¶ 226. See also *infra* Section IV (discussing the burdens and pitfalls of a new comprehensive data collection).

<sup>9</sup> CTIA comments at 8.

<sup>10</sup> See *infra* Section IV (discussing the problems with Option C in detail).

respond to any challenges that appear to be meritorious.<sup>11</sup> This further reduces the burdens of the Option B challenge process on both carriers and Commission staff.

An important benefit of Option B is its appropriate balancing of the burdens on challengers and challenged carriers. It requires challengers to conduct speed tests using drive test equipment or commercial speed test apps before submitting a challenge. This standard sets an appropriately high bar to prevent spurious challenges, yet is readily achievable, even for small carriers. As ATN and Blue Wireless observed, their support of the Option B requirement for evidence-based challenges demonstrates that it is not overly burdensome, even for small entities. “[N]either ATN nor Blue Wireless is large, and Blue Wireless is one of the smaller facilities-based wireless carriers in the country. If ATN and Blue Wireless are comfortable using Option B (both to mount and respond to challenges), it is difficult to imagine that any carrier will express a reasonable concern about the burdens it imposes.”<sup>12</sup> ATN has observed that, in its experience, the cost of conducting drive tests is about \$750 per test car per day, with the capability of testing 50-75 miles per day, depending on terrain.<sup>13</sup> As Blue Wireless has observed, even small wireless carriers typically own drive-testing equipment, and commercial drive-testing services offer a cost-effective alternative.<sup>14</sup> At the same time, the provision for testing with commercial speed test apps makes the process accessible for small entities or non-carrier entities that may not own drive testing equipment.

---

<sup>11</sup> See ATN/Blue Wireless comments at 3-4.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>13</sup> ATN Nov. 9 Ex Parte at 2.

<sup>14</sup> Letter from Brian Gelfand, President, Blue Wireless, to Marlene Dortch, FCC, WT Docket No. 10-208, at 1 (filed Nov. 9, 2016).

As a result, assertions that ““small carriers do not have anywhere near the physical resources needed to test thousands of census blocks or drive test a substantial portion of their rural service areas”” are simply red herrings that serve only to prolong the process and the legacy fund that the FCC intends to phase out with the implementation of MF-II.<sup>15</sup> There is no reason to believe that disputes will exist over such large portions of any carrier’s service territory. Even where fairly large-scale challenges are necessary, carriers’ existing testing capabilities, supplemented if necessary with targeted use of commercially available options, will be more than sufficient to conduct the necessary tests in a timely and cost-effective way. To the extent that other small carriers have concerns about preparing their challenges in the 60-day period proposed in Option B, ATN and Blue Wireless have no objection to extending the challenge period to 75 or 90 days.

The Option C challenge process (“Stage III”) adds certain attractive refinements to Option B, including those pertaining to time and distance between tests.<sup>16</sup> Specifically, Option C specifies that tests should be conducted between the hours of 6:00 am and midnight, show outdoor coverage, and be carried out at least ¼ mile but not more than 1 mile apart, at locations distributed across the entire challenge area.<sup>17</sup> It also proposes acceptable parameters for the collection of data from app-based speed tests,<sup>18</sup> and for the collection of data from commercial

---

<sup>15</sup> RWA comments at 9, quoting Letter from David LaFuria, counsel to Cellular South dba C Spire, Viaero Wireless, Smith Bagley, Inc., *et al.* (WT Docket No. 10-208) (filed Feb. 16, 2017).

<sup>16</sup> Further Notice, 32 FCC Rcd at 2238 ¶ 243.

<sup>17</sup> CTIA comments at 18-20.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.* at 19.

drive-test equipment.<sup>19</sup> These refinements are useful and should be incorporated into the Option B challenge process and adopted by the Commission.

On the other hand, other details of the Option C challenge process seem less well-conceived. CTIA stretches the 90-day timeline in Option B out to 150 days, though it is unclear why the additional processes requiring additional time are needed. CTIA proposes, for example: a hotline to provide a heads up regarding forthcoming challenges; subsequent provision of handset and other information; a certification process to protect confidential information; and a public notice process between the submission of challenges and responses.<sup>20</sup> The additional time that CTIA has associated with these processes can be avoided. For example, the up-front time to obtain handset information would be unnecessary if the Commission simply released the carrier-specific Form 477 shapefiles initially, along with any carrier-provided handset information.<sup>21</sup> Concerns about protecting provider-specific information can be addressed by requiring challengers initially to certify that any information will be used only for purposes of the MF-II challenge process.<sup>22</sup> Challenges can simply be served on the relevant carriers, saving both process time and staff effort. .

In sum, Option B – with the modifications discussed herein – represents a balanced approach that: establishes a substantial yet manageable burden of proof for challengers; allows the Commission to accurately identify areas lacking 4G LTE coverage; expeditiously resolves

---

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* at 20.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* at 17-22.

<sup>21</sup> To the extent that the Commission collects handset data for use by challengers, it should ensure that every filer includes an Android option, because Android devices are more readily compatible with commercial drive test equipment.

<sup>22</sup> CTIA comments at 17.



coverage disputes; and avoids unnecessary burdens on small providers while obtaining the benefits of MF-II with the least likelihood of further delay.

### **III. OPTION A HAS POSITIVE ELEMENTS, BUT COULD DELAY THE TRANSITION TO MF-II**

Option A is in many respects similar to Option B, except that it adds a first round with a low standard of proof/participation where challengers can submit challenges with only a certification and Form 477 filers can respond with only a propagation analysis.<sup>23</sup> If the parties are still in conflict, then actual test data are required, similar to Option B.<sup>24</sup> The record suggests that Option A would be less burdensome for challengers, and ATN and Blue Wireless have no objection to facilitating challenges. Both ATN and Blue Wireless are more likely to participate in the challenge process as challengers than challenged carriers, but frivolous challenges must be avoided..

The only concern about Option A is that, if the low standard associated with a valid challenge results in more challenges, it could take longer to implement and therefore delay the deployment of MF-II support. For example, the Commission could determine that, if it adopts Option A, it must allow a greater period of time for the challenge process to proceed.<sup>25</sup> ATN and Blue Wireless share the Commission's goal of deploying MF-II support as expeditiously as possible to begin to move away from the legacy program and expand 4G LTE coverage in rural areas that lack it today. Thus, to the extent that the Commission adopts Option A or some

---

<sup>23</sup> See Further Notice, 32 FCC Rcd at 2236-38 ¶¶ 232-40.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> See *id.* at 2238 ¶ 239 (seeking comment on how much time should be allowed for submission of actual speed data).

variant thereof, it should ensure it remains on schedule to complete the challenge process by the end of January 2018.<sup>26</sup>

#### **IV. THE NEW DATA COLLECTION IN OPTION C WOULD UNDERMINE THE COMMISSION'S GOALS**

CTIA has proposed that the Commission impose a one-time, apparently mandatory collection of coverage shapefiles from all Form 477 filers based on “consistent settings and assumptions” that CTIA asserts would be more appropriate for MF-II purposes.<sup>27</sup> ATN and Blue Wireless are concerned that a new data collection is inconsistent with the Commission’s goals because it could significantly delay the transition of mobile universal service support to MF-II, undermine the goal of MF-II to focus support on areas that lack coverage today, and may not result in any more accurate coverage data than the current Form 477 shapefiles.

##### **A. A New Data Collection Could Significantly Delay Implementation of MF-II**

Rural Americans that lack access to mobile services have already waited four years longer than expected to receive the benefits of MF-II, which the Commission was to adopt in 2012 and implement in 2013.<sup>28</sup> It is therefore of critical importance that the Commission transition support as soon as possible to MF-II so that rural Americans that lack coverage today can begin to receive service. A new data collection would significantly undermine this goal.

First, the timeline for receiving Office of Management and Budget (“OMB”) approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act (“PRA”) for a data collection of this scope is entirely unpredictable and could be protracted. Without the supplemental data collection, the

---

<sup>26</sup> Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2154 ¶ 3.

<sup>27</sup> CTIA comments at 4-5.

<sup>28</sup> *Connect America Fund, et al.*, Report and Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 26 FCC Rcd 17663, 17675 ¶ 29 (2011) (subsequent history omitted).

Commission would at most need OMB approval for whatever form it establishes for carriers to submit challenges. Getting approval for a form to be used only by challengers is a much simpler exercise than obtaining approval for a voluminous, single-purpose, industry-wide data collection. The most analogous example is the data collection in the Business Data Services proceeding, which took about nine months for OMB approval, despite concerted Commission efforts.<sup>29</sup> If any carriers object to the data collection at OMB, the timeline would be extended even further. It is entirely unclear how long it would take to obtain OMB approval for the proposed new data collection in Option C, but anywhere between four and nine months would be reasonable estimates. Even at the low end, this additional step would substantially delay the transition to MF-II.

Second, the Commission could need to procure a vendor to administer elements of the process described in Option C. CTIA's comments raise the possibility of a vendor being involved in facilitating information-sharing for challenges.<sup>30</sup> CTIA does not offer details about the process or timing for this element of the proposal, but the Commission presumably would have to follow typical government procurement rules to contract with such a vendor. This process also would further delay the auction and thus the transition to MF-II.

Third, the Commission would have to build into the process sufficient time for carriers to assemble the data pursuant to the prescribed parameters. CTIA does not indicate how much time

---

<sup>29</sup> See *Business Data Services in an Internet Protocol Environment*, Tariff Investigation Order and Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 31 FCC Rcd 4723, 4740 ¶ 36 & n.78 (2016) ("The Bureau submitted the collection to [OMB] for review as required by the PRA, and after a lengthy review process, OMB approved the collection subject to modification on August 15, 2014.") (The footnote indicates that OMB sought comment on the request for approval by public notice published Dec. 9, 2013, suggesting that the FCC would have submitted it in November 2013 or sooner.)

<sup>30</sup> CTIA comments at 17.

carriers would be given to respond to the data collection, but it would not be trivial. The new data collection would be tantamount to a supplemental Form 477 filing for CMRS carriers. The Commission estimates that responding to Form 477 takes approximately 387 hours per response (i.e., approximately five weeks' full-time work for two people).<sup>31</sup> The time delay for carriers to assemble the data for the data collection alone would introduce an unacceptable delay in the deployment of MF-II. In addition a new data collection would impose a significant and unanticipated administrative and cost burden on all carriers, but particularly on small entities with limited resources.<sup>32</sup>

Fourth, Commission staff would need time to process the data received in the data collection. The data would be essentially a supplemental Form 477 filing, so the process would be identical to what the Commission staff undertakes in order to release the prior sample maps based on earlier Form 477 submissions.<sup>33</sup> This would further delay the timeline.

Fifth, as noted above, the timeline proposed for the Option C challenge process needlessly stretches a 90-day process out to 150 days.<sup>34</sup> This adds two additional months (at minimum) to the already substantial delays in the deployment of MF-II.

All told, it appears that adopting the Option C data collection would introduce a minimum of six months and potentially twelve months or more of delay in the timeline to conduct the auction. CTIA argues that the new data collection would expedite the process

---

<sup>31</sup> FCC Form 477 Instructions at 38 (2016).

<sup>32</sup> As discussed below, it is not entirely clear that the added burden of the data collection would be offset by a less burdensome challenge process. *See infra* Section IV.C.

<sup>33</sup> *See Working Toward Mobility Fund II: Mobile Broadband Coverage Data and Analysis* (WTB Sept. 30, 2016), [https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs\\_public/attachmatch/DOC-341539A1.pdf](https://apps.fcc.gov/edocs_public/attachmatch/DOC-341539A1.pdf).

<sup>34</sup> *See supra* Section II.

because it “should result in fewer and more targeted challenges.”<sup>35</sup> For CTIA’s tentative conclusion to be true, the new data collection process would have to be near-flawless, otherwise there is a substantial risk that the challenge process will be difficult and protracted. Beta-testing new data collection standards and procedures in this important context is ill-advised. Even if the data collection does reduce the number of challenges (which is not at all clear),<sup>36</sup> there is no way that the reduction would make up for the months of delay that would flow from the new data collection – particularly as compared to Option B.<sup>37</sup>

The data collection in Option C would significantly delay the transition of mobile universal service support to MF-II. The Commission should reject it.

**B. The Option C Data Collection May Undermine the Goal of Expanding Mobile Coverage to Unserved Areas**

The explicit goal of MF-II is to “advance the deployment of 4G LTE service to *areas that are so costly that the private sector has not yet deployed there* and to preserve such service where it might not otherwise exist.”<sup>38</sup> To do so, the Commission concluded it should “target universal service funding to *coverage gaps*, not areas already built out by private capital.”<sup>39</sup> Despite CTIA’s assertions of “concerns ... about the suitability of the Form 477 data for the unique purposes of MF-II,”<sup>40</sup> the Commission in fact required wireless carriers to submit

---

<sup>35</sup> CTIA comments at 6.

<sup>36</sup> *See infra* Section IV.C.

<sup>37</sup> *See supra* Section II (discussing how the rigorous threshold for challenges under Option B will ensure that only serious challenges are mounted).

<sup>38</sup> Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2154 ¶ 2 (emphasis added).

<sup>39</sup> *Id.* at 2156 ¶ 14 (emphasis added).

<sup>40</sup> CTIA comments at 2.

shapefile coverage maps with their Form 477 filings in order to “‘fulfill [its] universal service mandate.’”<sup>41</sup>

The Form 477 requires carriers to certify that their shapefiles represent “‘the coverage boundaries where, according to providers, users should expect the minimum advertised upload and download data speeds associated with [a] network technology,’ such as LTE.”<sup>42</sup> The Option C collection, however, would specify that the shapefiles represent the boundaries where they provide 5 Mbps downlink service with a 90% probability at the cell edge and an area probability of 95%.<sup>43</sup> Because of the difference between these two standards, carriers responding to the Option C data collection are likely to report as “unserved” many areas where 4G LTE service is available today, simply because the prescribed modeling does not result in a high enough level of probability. This would mean that many areas would be eligible for MF-II that are not true “coverage gaps” and where private capital has already been deployed to provide service.

Moreover, because the true “coverage gaps” are likely to be the highest-cost areas to build out and serve, these new eligible areas that are likely to appear in the Option C data collection are likely to be lower-cost areas than the areas identified as unserved in the Form 477 data. As a result, they are more likely to receive winning bids in a reverse auction than the higher-cost areas where support is more critical. In this way, the Option C data collection actually will funnel MF-II support away from the coverage gap areas where it is needed to areas where it simply will be used to upgrade existing 4G LTE service. This will undermine MF-II’s

---

<sup>41</sup> Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2175 ¶ 57.

<sup>42</sup> *Id.*, quoting *Modernizing the FCC Form 477 Data Program*, Report and Order, 28 FCC Rcd 9887, 9908-09 ¶ 42 (2013).

<sup>43</sup> CTIA comments at 12.

ability to extend mobile service further out into rural areas, potentially significantly. This is a compelling reason not to implement the Option C data collection as proposed.

**C. The Option C Data Collection May Not Result in More Accurate Coverage Data or Fewer Challenges**

Despite the stated goal of a data collection “using consistent settings and assumptions that are tailored to facilitate identification of unserved rural areas for MF-II purposes,”<sup>44</sup> the specified parameters remain sufficiently loose that there will be significant variations in the data reported. There are a number of significant variables that go into the “tuning” of a propagation model that are not specified in the CTIA proposal, including clutter and other assumptions designed to account for terrain and other local conditions. These variables can have a significant impact on the outcome of the model. As a result, the Option C data collection is unlikely to produce a uniform set of coverage maps.

Moreover, other specifications in Option C, including the use of very rough 100m BINS,<sup>45</sup> will undermine the likelihood that the modeled shapefiles submitted in the data collection will accurately predict actual coverage.

In light of the variables that exist in the new reporting parameters, a data collection specifically for the purpose of determining MF-II eligible areas raises the prospect of intentional or inadvertent skewing of data submitted by reporting carriers. For example, some carriers may skew their assumptions in a way that overstates their coverage in order to block the prospect of a competitor receiving a subsidy in their licensed area. Other carriers may skew their assumptions to understate their coverage to create eligibility for areas where they have already deployed facilities but would like financial assistance to support service upgrades. In either case, MF-II

---

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 4.

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* at 11.

support will be shunted away from bringing service to “coverage gap” areas that would not otherwise be economic to serve with private capital.<sup>46</sup>

For all these reasons, it does not appear likely that the Option C data collection would produce “reliable, standardized coverage data” for purposes of the MF-II auction.<sup>47</sup> The Option C data collection would impose a lengthy delay on the deployment of MF-II and substantial new burdens on carriers and the Commission without ensuring either that coverage data would be more accurate or that fewer carriers would assert challenges to the initial map of eligible areas. The new data collection would run directly counter to the Commission’s goals with regard to MF-II and must be rejected.

## **V. CONCLUSION**

Option B’s combination of existing Form 477 information, a reasonable and focused challenge process, and minimal burdens on current carriers and challengers presents an optimal balance to permit the entire process, including the auction, to be accomplished quickly and accurately such that the challenge process can be completed by the Commission’s stated date of January 31, 2018 at the latest. This will allow the Commission to transition as quickly as possible to Mobility Fund Phase II.

---

<sup>46</sup> CTIA perhaps anticipates this by requiring an engineer’s certification of the new data in addition to the officer certification that is required on Form 477. CTIA comments at 13. This is helpful, but given the variability of permissible submissions under the standards, may not be sufficient to prevent the undesired result.

<sup>47</sup> CTIA comments at 8, quoting Order, 32 FCC Rcd at 2176-77 ¶ 58.



By contrast, the proposed new data collection in Option C would significantly delay the MF-II auction without ensuring that the Commission obtains better data or receives fewer challenges. ATN and Blue Wireless therefore urge the Commission to adopt Option B for the challenge process.

Respectfully submitted,

**ATN International, Inc.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Douglas J. Minster  
Vice President, Government and  
Regulatory Affairs  
500 Cummings Center  
Suite 2450  
Beverly, MA 01915  
(978) 619-1303

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
L. Charles Keller  
**Wilkinson Barker Knauer LLP**  
1800 M Street, NW, Suite 800 North  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 383-3414  
*Counsel to ATN International  
and Blue Wireless*

**Buffalo-Lake Erie Wireless  
Systems Co., L.L.C. d/b/a Blue  
Wireless**

By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Brian Gelfand  
President  
4915 Auburn Avenue  
Suite 200  
Bethesda, MD 20814  
(716) 631-2011

May 11, 2017